



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.237

CRM-M-20798-2026
Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

MANPREET SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ritu Raj Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mohd. Uzair, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) has been filed for grant of regular
bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 202 dated 05.12.2025, registered under
Sections 109 and 118(2) of BNS (corresponding to Sections 307 and 326 of
IPC) and Sections 25, 54, 59 and Section 27 of Arms Act (added later on),
(corresponding to Sections 31, 54-A, 58 and 33 of IPC) at Police Station
Lalru, District SAS Nagar.

2. Brief facts of this case are that the FIR was registered on the
statement of Rahul Sharma, a housekeeping supervisor at Omax Green
Society, Jharmari. On 05.12.2025, while tenant Manpreet Singh was
vacating his flat, Rahul sent his brother Ankur Sharma to inspect it. During
the inspection, Manpreet allegedly assaulted Ankur. When Rahul intervened,



Manpreet abused and pushed him, then took out a pistol and fired—one shot in the air and another at Rahul with intent to kill, hitting his left thigh. Rahul was subsequently taken to MM Hospital, Sadaipur, for treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the parties have arrived at a compromise, and has placed on record a copy of the compromise deed dated 16.03.2026 along with the affidavits (Annexures P-2 to P-4). It is further contended that, in view of the compromise effected between the parties, the petitioner is entitled to the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, with the assistance of Mr. Mohd. Uzair, learned counsel for the complainant, who has appeared and filed his power of attorney, does not dispute the said fact and submits that he has no objection if the petitioner is granted bail in the present case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the fact that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled to the concession of regular bail. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of this Court in *Ajay v. State of Haryana, CRM-M-38814-2022, decided on 15.09.2022*, wherein it has been held that the petitioner may be granted the concession of bail on the basis of compromise.

7. In view of the above and without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the condition that he shall appear before the trial Court on each



and every date of hearing and shall not influence the prosecution witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.

8. It is, however, clarified that nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

29.04.2026

Anu

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No

(MANDEEP PANNU)

JUDGE